

1 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2 FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY

3 : CIVIL ACTION NUMBER:  
4 : 19-md-02875  
5 :  
6 :  
7 :  
8 :  
9 :  
10 :  
11 :  
12 :  
13 :  
14 :  
15 :  
16 :  
17 :  
18 :  
19 :  
20 :  
21 :  
22 :  
23 :  
24 :  
25 :

IN RE: VALSARTAN PRODUCTS  
LIABILITY LITIGATION

Mitchell H. Cohen Building & U.S. Courthouse  
4th & Cooper Streets  
Camden, New Jersey 08101  
February 14, 2024  
Commencing at 3:03 p.m.

**B E F O R E:** THOMAS I. VANASKIE (RET.)  
SPECIAL MASTER

**A P P E A R A N C E S:**

MAZIE SLATER KATZ & FREEMAN, LLC  
BY: ADAM M. SLATER, ESQUIRE  
103 Eisenhower Parkway  
Roseland, New Jersey 07068  
For the Plaintiffs

SKADDEN, ARPS, SLATE, MEAGHER & FLOM LLP  
BY: NINA R. ROSE, ESQUIRE  
1440 New York Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20005  
For the Defendants Princeton Pharmaceuticals, Solco  
Healthcare U.S. LLC, and Zhejiang Huahai  
Pharmaceuticals Ltd.

**ALSO PRESENT:**

LORETTA SMITH, ESQUIRE  
Judicial Law Clerk to The Honorable Robert B. Kugler  
LARRY MACSTRAVIC, Courtroom Deputy

Ann Marie Mitchell, CRR, RDR, CCR, Official Court Reporter  
AnnMarie\_Mitchell@njdc.uscourts.gov  
(856) 576-7018  
Proceedings recorded by mechanical stenography; transcript  
produced by computer-aided transcription.

1 (PROCEEDINGS held telephonically before SPECIAL  
2 MASTER THOMAS I. VANASKIE at 3:03 p.m.)

3 SPECIAL MASTER VANASKIE: I think, Adam, it was your  
4 side that asked for the call. I could have that wrong.

5 MR. SLATER: We did?

6 SPECIAL MASTER VANASKIE: Well, I thought it was. I  
7 mean...

8 MR. SLATER: I don't think we did, but if we did, I  
9 will certainly own that.

10 SPECIAL MASTER VANASKIE: I have an email from Chris  
11 Geddis that said: Dear Judge Vanaskie, Plaintiffs' opposition  
12 is currently due February 20th, so we'd like to discuss the  
13 motion with the Court earlier if possible. Plaintiffs are  
14 available February 14 and 16. Would that work for everyone  
15 else?

16 And this is the motion -- I had it up in front of me,  
17 the motion to amend the answer.

18 MR. SLATER: Your Honor, I think -- at the risk of  
19 complicating the situation, it was my understanding that Your  
20 Honor had asked us if we could talk, and that email from Chris  
21 was just letting you know that if this call had to do with  
22 that motion, we just figured it would be better to do in  
23 advance of the date that our brief was due in case the call  
24 would relate to something we might brief. So we were just  
25 trying to make sure if this had to do with the motion, that it

1 wouldn't get -- we wouldn't talk on the day that our brief was  
2 due as opposed to in advance. I think that's what that email  
3 was about.

4 SPECIAL MASTER VANASKIE: I'm still confused.

5 MR. SLATER: I think you asked for this call, and  
6 then we were trying to schedule it. And I think we offered  
7 some dates and they didn't work for Nina, I think. And then  
8 we went back, and you said you were available on two dates.  
9 And we then -- I think Chris spoke to Nina or emailed with her  
10 and then was getting back to you to ask, if we're going to  
11 talk about the motion, just to talk about it in advance of the  
12 return date.

13 But we certainly didn't see a need to have a call on  
14 it. We weren't initiating that, but we assumed you had some  
15 questions or wanted to talk about --

16 SPECIAL MASTER VANASKIE: Okay. All right. This is  
17 a classic ships-passing-in-the-night situation.

18 So your response is due February 20th.

19 MR. SLATER: That's my understanding, yes.

20 SPECIAL MASTER VANASKIE: Response to the motion.

21 And then we'll address it after we get your response.

22 MR. SLATER: Okay.

23 SPECIAL MASTER VANASKIE: All right. I don't -- I'm  
24 sorry for the -- I was confused. Obviously I didn't clear up  
25 any confusion.

1 MR. SLATER: A light moment in the middle of all the  
2 things we're doing is welcome.

3 LAW CLERK: Excuse me, Judge Vanaskie. I think Nina  
4 was -- Skadden Arps had asked to hold the discussion on  
5 another day besides February 20th because the ZHP defendants  
6 had a conflict on the 19th, which is when you had originally  
7 asked counsel to schedule the conference call. So any other  
8 day, I guess, after the return date would work, that, you  
9 know, all the parties can join in on.

10 SPECIAL MASTER VANASKIE: Yes. I think it will work  
11 fine. I think what I'd like to propose is I await the filing  
12 of the response from plaintiffs.

13 Ms. Rose, if you're going to file any reply, do it  
14 promptly.

15 MS. ROSE: Okay.

16 SPECIAL MASTER VANASKIE: And then we'll see. You  
17 know, it may not require a conference call or oral argument.  
18 I mean, it's a fairly straightforward matter, it seems. Maybe  
19 I'm wrong on that. And if --

20 MS. ROSE: The ZHP defendants certainly think it is,  
21 so we're happy to read plaintiffs' opposition brief and  
22 respond to it if need be quickly.

23 SPECIAL MASTER VANASKIE: All right.

24 MR. SLATER: Sounds good.

25 SPECIAL MASTER VANASKIE: Is that good on the

1 plaintiffs' side as well?

2 MR. SLATER: Of course.

3 SPECIAL MASTER VANASKIE: Okay, great. So we'll  
4 await the reply. I'm not going to change the date. It's due  
5 February 20th. And then we'll give you five days after that  
6 to respond, Ms. Rose. And then we'll go from there.

7 MS. ROSE: Thank you, Your Honor.

8 SPECIAL MASTER VANASKIE: All right? Okay?

9 MR. SLATER: Thank you very much.

10 SPECIAL MASTER VANASKIE: Thank you all very much.

11 Bye-bye.

12 (Proceedings concluded at 3:08 p.m.)

13 I certify that the foregoing is a correct transcript  
14 from the record of proceedings in the above-entitled matter.

15 /S/ Ann Marie Mitchell                      15th day of February, 2024  
16 Court Reporter/Transcriber              Date

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25